UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FILED FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION JN JUL X 7 2008 7-7-2008

NORMA CRUZ-NUNEZ	MICHAEL W. DOBBINS CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
	CIVIL ACTION
(Name of the plaintiff or plaintiffs)	
KIMCO CORPORATION) 1 08cv3841) JUDGE DER-YEGHIYAN) MAG. JUDGE KEYS)
(Name of the defendant or defendants)	}
COMPLAINT OF EMP	LOYMENT DISCRIMINATION
1. This is an action for employment discrin	nination.
2. The plaintiff is NORMA CRU	
county of	in the state of <u>TLLIPOIS</u>
3. The defendant is KINCO CORF	oration , whose
street address is 7300 W	. Montrose
	(state) <u>TL</u> (ZIP) 60706
(Defendant's telephone number) 708	<u> 583 9800 </u>
4. The plaintiff sought employment or	was employed by the defendant at (street address)
7300 W. Montros	.1
(county) COOK (state) IL	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
5. The plaintiff [check one box]	
(a) was denied employment by	the defendant.
(b) was hired and is still employ	
(c) was employed but is no long	ger employed by the defendant.

6. The defendant discriminated against the plaintiff on or about, or beginning on or about, (month) <u>lecember</u> , (day) 30, (year) 2004.				
7.1 (Choose paragraph 7.1 or 7.2, do not complete both.) (a) The defendant is not a federal governmental agency, and the plaintiff [check one filed a charge or charges against the defendant box] has per has asserting the acts of discrimination indicated in this complaint with any of the following government				
agencies:				
(i) the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, on or about (month) June (day) 16 (year) 2005				
(ii) the Illinois Department of Human Rights, on or about (month) June (day) 16 (year) 2005. (b) If charges were filed with an agency indicated above, a copy of the charge is				
attached. YES. NO, but plaintiff will file a copy of the charge within 14 days.				
It is the policy of both the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Illinois Department				
of Human Rights to cross-file with the other agency all charges received. The plaintiff has no reason				
to believe that this policy was not followed in this case.				
7.2 The defendant is a federal governmental agency, and (a) the plaintiff previously filed a Complaint of Employment Discrimination with the defendant asserting the acts of discrimination indicated in this court complaint.				
Yes (month) (day) (year)				
No, did not file Complaint of Employment Discrimination				
The plaintiff received a Final Agency Decision on (month) (day)(year) c. Attached is a copy of the				
 a. Complaint of Employment Discrimination, YES NO, but a copy will be filed within 14 days. 				
(ii) Final Agency Decision				
YES NO, but a copy will be filed within 14 days.				

8.	(Complete paragraph 8 only if defendant is not a federal governmental agency.)
	(a) the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has not issued a
	Notice of Right to Sue.
	(b) the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has issued a Notice
	of Right to Sue, which was received by the plaintiff on (month)
	(day) (year) a copy of which Notice is attached to this
	complaint.
9,	The defendant discriminated against the plaintiff because of the plaintiff's [check only those
	that apply]:
	(a) Age (Age Discrimination Employment Act).
	(b) Color (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 42 U.S.C. §1981).
	(c) Disability (Americans with Disabilities Act or Rehabilitation Act)
	(d) National Origin (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 42 U.S.C. §1981).
	(e) Race (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 42 U.S.C. §1981).
	(f) Religion (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964) (g) Sex (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964) UNLAW Ful RETALIATION
10.	If the defendant is a state, county, municipal (city, town or village) or other local
10.	governmental agency, plaintiff further alleges discrimination on the basis of race, color, or
	national origin (42 U.S.C. § 1983).
11.	Jurisdiction over the statutory violation alleged is conferred as follows: for Title VII claims
	by 28 U.S.C.§1331, 28 U.S.C.§1343(a)(3), and 42 U.S.C.§2000e-5(f)(3); for 42 U.S.C.§1981
	and §1983 by 42 U.S.C.§1988; for the A.D.E.A. by 42 U.S.C.§12117; for the Rehabilitation
	Act, 29 U.S.C. § 791.
12.	The defendant [check only those that apply]
	(a) failed to hire the plaintiff.
	(b) terminated the plaintiff's employment.
	(c) failed to promote the plaintiff.

	(d) ☐ f	ailed to reasonably accommodate the plaintiff's religion.
	(e) 1	ailed to reasonably accommodate the plaintiff's disabilities.
	(f)	failed to stop harassment;
	(g) ☐ (h) ☐	retaliated against the plaintiff because the plaintiff did something to assert rights protected by the laws identified in paragraphs 9 and 10 above; other (specify): Refer to Atlahnent INCORPORTED by
	Reta	erence as if specifically Recited here in
13.	The fac	ets supporting the plaintiff's claim of discrimination are as follows:
	_R	efer to Attachment INCORPORATED by Reference
	\&	if specifically Recited herein
	 -	
		
14.		DISCRIMINATION ONLY] Defendant knowingly, intentionally, and willfully ninated against the plaintiff.
15.		aintiff demands that the case be tried by a jury. X YES NO
16.		EFORE, the plaintiff asks that the court grant the following relief to the plaintiff nly those that apply]
	(a) 🛣	Direct the defendant to hire the plaintiff.
	(b) X	Direct the defendant to re-employ the plaintiff.
	(c)	Direct the defendant to promote the plaintiff.
	(d)	Direct the defendant to reasonably accommodate the plaintiff's religion.
	(e)	Direct the defendant to reasonably accommodate the plaintiff's disabilities.

(f)	Direct the defendant to (specify):
(g) X	If available, grant the plaintiff appropriate injunctive relief, lost wages, liquidated/double damages, front pay, compensatory damages, punitive damages, prejudgment interest, post-judgment interest, and costs, including reasonable attorney fees and expert witness fees.
(h)	Grant such other relief as the Court may find appropriate.
`	ff's signature)
Nom	es Nons Cres
(Plainti	5 E. IRVING PARK RD ITASCA IL 60143
	ff's street address)
(City) (Plaintiff's	(State)(ZIP)
	Date: 7 - 7-0 8

Page 6 of 11

I.

A. ISSUE/BASIS

Complainant contends that Respondent subjected her to unequal terms and conditions of employment, unequal discipline, resulting in her termination on <u>December 30, 2004</u> because of her sex, female and in retaliation for her objection to same in violation of <u>Title VII, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended.</u>

B. PRIMA FACIE CASE

- 1. Complainant is sex female;
- 2. In November 2002 Complainant was subjected to several serial acts of sexual harassment and was threatened that should she complain she would be terminated;
- 3. In November 2002 Complainant contacted the Respondent's Human Resources Director and filed an internal complaint of sexual harassment;
 - 4. Complainant filed a charge of Title VII discrimination against Respondent in 2003;
- 5. On <u>December 30, 2004</u> Respondent <u>terminated</u> Complainant's employment for alleged falsification of her citizenship/residency papers and for specifically refusing to sign employment documents in December 2004 which would have effectively made her appear to be a new employee without any seniority after she had worked for the company for many years previous;
- 6. Complainant contends that Respondent had a practice up to the time of her discharge of hiring and retaining workers whom Respondent had good reason to know were not legally eligible to work in this country and continuously did nothing to ascertain their correct legal residency status nor did it penalize said workers for such status, much less deny them their seniority:
 - a. Worker Erica Lopez whose real name is Sylvia Torres was still at Respondent when Complainant was discharged even after she informed Respondent previously of her legal name and she was not denied any seniority after the disclosure of her real name and she had not previously filed any discrimination charges against Respondent;
 - b. Workers: Maria Tenorio; Adriana Echeveria; Yolanda Martinez; Martina Flores; Juan Martinez, Pedro Salazar, Dolores Barrajas, Maria Lujan were all working at Respondent with false papers during the time frame of Complainant's discharge which was clearly known to Respondent and Respondent did not penalize said workers much less terminate their employment;
 - c. Worker Pedro Salazar during the time of the events described in Complainant's Complaint worked in Respondent's Human Resources Department and observed Respondent's filing system where workers who were documented were placed in one section of the filing system and workers who were

undocumented were placed in another section of the filing system; workers who were undocumented routinely only provided only a social security card number (bogus) and a green card supposedly from INS (bogus); these workers could not provide a State of Illinois ID or State of Illinois Driver's License so all these employees were segregated out of the regular human resources filing system for documented employees and their files were flagged as such in addition to being segregated; these employees were undocumented, had never raised any objections to unlawful discrimination and were never penalized much less terminated at the time of Complainant's discharge; their personnel files were clearly flagged as undocumented; Respondent up until that point never made any undocumented employee start all over again with no seniority after disclosing his/her prior undocumented status to Respondent;

- d. Worker Pedro Salazar specifically noticed that Complainant's personnel file was segregated from all the other files in the human resources filing system displaying Respondent's intent on singling her out for focus and different treatment since she was the only one (as far as she knows) to have filed unlawful discrimination charges against Respondent;
- 6. Complainant contends that Respondent terminated her employment because of her several previous charge filings against Respondent referring to sex, female discrimination/sexual harassment;
- 7. Complainant contends that Respondent terminated her employment on <u>December 30</u>, <u>2004</u> because of her sex, female and in retaliation for objecting to unlawful sexual harassment in violation of <u>Title VII</u>, the <u>Civil Rights Act of 1964</u>, as amended.

Case 1:08-cv-03841 Document 2 Filed 07/07/2008 Page 8 of 11 U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

DISMISSAL AND NOTICE OF MIGHTS	DISMISSAL	AND	NOTICE	OF	RIGHTS
--------------------------------	-----------	-----	--------	----	---------------

Heart Bautz	

Mr. Rafael Molinary, Esq. To:

From: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

	Law Office of Rafael Molina Attorneys at Law	-	Chicago District Of 500 West Madison			
	3930 North Pine Grove Ave Chicago, IL 60613-5503	nue, Suite 715	Suite 2800 Chicago, Illinois 60	9661-2511		
	On behalf of person(s) aggrieved whose CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR § 1601.7(a))	identity is				
EEOC Cha	rge No.	EEOC Representative		Telephone No.		
-)5-02688	•	Local Coordinator	(312) 886-5973		
THE EEO	Ç IS CLOSING ITS FILE ON THIS CI			•		
	The facts alleged in the charge fail to sta	ate a claim under any of the s	tatutes enforced by the EEOC.			
	Your allegations did not involve a disabil	lity as defined by the America	ns with Disabilities Act.			
	The Respondent employs less than the	required number of employee	s or is not otherwise covered by	the statutes.		
	Your charge was not timely filed with EE	OC; in other words, you waite	ed too long after the date(s) of th	e alleged discrimination to file your charge.		
	Having been given 30 days in which to otherwise failed to cooperate to the exte			be available for interviews/conferences, or		
	White reasonable efforts were made to le	ocate you, we were not able t	o do so.			
	You were given 30 days to accept a reas	sonable settlement offer that a	affords full relief for the harm yo	u alleged.		
The EEOC issues the following determination: Based upon its investigation, the EEOC is unable to conclude that the information obtations of the statutes. This does not certify that the respondent is in compliance with the statutes. No finding is made as to any issues that might be construed as having been raised by this charge.						
х	The EEOC has adopted the findings of t	he state or local fair employm	ent practices agency that invest	ligated this charge.		
	Other (briefly state)					
	(- NOTICE OF SU See the additional information				
of dismiss on this ch	sal and of your right to sue that we v	vill send you. You may fi r lawsult must be filed <u>V</u>	le a lawsuit against the res <u>VITHIN 90 DAYS</u> of your	ent Act: This will be the only notice pondent(s) under federal law based receipt of this Notice; or your right nay be different.)		
EPA unde				s for willful violations) of the alleged than 2 years (3 years) before you		
		On behalf of the Commit	ssion			
		John P. 9 nn P. Rowe, District	Rowe	APR 0 8 2008		
Enclosure(s) Joi	n P. Rowe, District	Director	Day (Date Malled)		
cc: K	IMCO CORPORATION			April 9/2008 Ru		

<u> </u>			05M:0617.0		
CHARGE OF DISCRIMINAT	ION	AGENCY	CHARGE NUMBER		
This form is affected by the Privacy Act of 1974; See Privacy act statement before		X FEPA	2005CF3859		
Completing this form.		[Z] X ; X ;	00000		
Illinois Department of Human R	Illinois Department of Human Rights abit XX				
State or local Ag	gency, if any		/////		
NAME Conductor Str. Mr. Str. 1	- MICHE	·	630) 285-1032		
1 · · · %	- NUNC		630) 285-1037		
NAMED IS THE EMPLOYER-LABOR ORGANIZATION, EMPLOYMENT AGENCY APPRENTICESHIP COMMITTEE.					
STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY WHO DIS	SCHIMINATED.	AGAINST ME A	lf marrithum auer, fine heinen <u>.</u>		
Kimes Cornoration	MEMBERS	SIPLAVRICK 15+	TELEPTRONE (Im hale dres Code)		
7 7 CITY, ST.	ATE AND EIP CODE		Cecury		
MONTEOSE NO	ariage	<u> </u>	TELEPHONE (Intent tree Code)		
STREET ADDRESS					
	TE AND ZIP COBE		COUNTY		
CAUSE OF DISCRIMINATION BASED ON (Check appropriate has (48))			DATE DISCRIMINATION TOOK PLACE		
MACK COLOR MEN RELIG	GION NA	HONAL ORNER	KARLIEST (AREAGEPA) LAITSTOALL)		
RETALIATION AGE D	ISABILITY	COTHER	12/30/04		
THE CARTICULARS ARE: It auditional space is morded, attach in tra shociful.)		,	CONTRACTOR VICEROR		
Attache D A) NIZ [W.] 1 V.	Peterence	DEPT CHECARD HIGHTS		
I sten want this charge filed with the EEQC. I will advise the NOTARY - (when property in Superior States)					
NOTARY - (when normally the State and I wall engineers it is the processing of my charge in accordance with their procedures. The processing of my charge in accordance with their procedures. The processing of my charge in accordance with their procedures. The processing of my charge in accordance with their procedures. The processing of my charge in accordance with their procedures. The processing of my charge in accordance with their procedures. The processing of my charge in accordance with their procedures.					
clare mader negative of properties the ferrolesses and a second	SIGNATURE OF	M. Sand Barker! CARREST A VALLAGE			
RACHELR GARAY			DATE		
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES 08/21/200F	SUBSCRIBED AND SWIRN TO BEFORE ME VIIIS DATE (Day, Whath, and war)				
C FORM 5 (50%)	and a second				

A. ISSUE/BASIS

Complainant contends that Respondent subjected her to unequal terms and conditions of employment, unequal discipline, resulting in her termination on <u>December 30. 2004</u> because of her sex, female and in retaliation for her objection to same in violation of the Illinois Human Rights Act;

B. PRIMA FACIE CASE

- 1. Complainant is sex female;
- 2. In November 2002 Complainant was subjected to several serial acts of sexual harassment and was threatened that should she complain she would be terminated;
- 3. In November 2002 Complainant contacted the Respondent's Human Resources Director and filed an internal complaint of sexual harassment;
 - 4. Complainant filed a charge of Title VII discrimination against Respondent in 2003;
- 5. On <u>December 30, 2004</u> Respondent <u>terminated</u> Complainant's employment for alleged falsification; Complainant <u>denies</u> that she committed falsification;
- 6. Complainant contends that Respondent terminated her employment because of her several previous charge filings against Respondent referring to sex, female discrimination/sexual harassment;
- 7. Complainant contends that Respondent terminated her employment on <u>December 30</u>, <u>2004</u> because of her sex, female and in retaliation for objecting to unlawful sexual harassment in violation of the Illinois Human Rights Act.

[Note: Complainant understands that the Department can only investigate harms occurring no later than 180 days from the date of the filing of the charge; therefore it is understood and acknowledged that the Department will only investigate the <u>discharge count</u> detailed herein.]

FILING SUIT IN COURT OF COMPETENT JURISDICTION

PRIVATE SUIT RIGHTS:

This issuance of this Notice of Right to Sue ends EEOC's process with respect to your charge. You may file a lawsuit against the respondent named in your charge within 90 days from the date you receive this Notice. Therefore you should keep a record of this date. Once this 90-day period is over, your right to sue is lost. If you intend to consult an attorney, you should do so as soon as possible. Furthermore, in order to avoid any question that you did not act in a timely manner, if you intend to sue on your own behalf, your suit should be filed well in advance of the expiration of the 90-day period.

You may file your lawsuit in a court of competent jurisdiction. Filing this Notice is not sufficient. A court complaint must contain a short statement of the facts of your case which shows that you are entitled to relief. Generally, suits are brought in the state where the alleged unlawful practice occurred, but in some cases can be brought where relevant employment records are kept, where the employment would have been, or where the respondent has its main office.

You may contact EEOC if you have any questions about your rights, including advice on which court can hear your case, or if you need to inspect and copy information contained in the case file.

A lawsuit against a private employer is generally filed in the U.S. District Court.

A lawsuit under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, against a State agency or a political subdivision of the State is also generally filed in the U.S. District Court.

However, a lawsuit under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act or the Americans with Disabilities Act or, probably, the Equal Pay Act against a State instrumentality (an agency directly funded and controlled by the State) can only be filed in a State court.

A lawsuit under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act or the Americans with Disabilities Act or the Equal Pay Act against a political subdivision of the State, such as municipalities and counties, may be filed in the U.S. District Court.

For a list of U.S. District Courts, please see reverse side.

IF THE FIRST THREE CHARACTERS OF YOUR <u>EEOC CHARGE NUMBER</u> ARE "21B" <u>AND</u> YOUR CHARGE WAS INVESTIGATED BY THE ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS (IDHR), REQUEST FOR REVIEWING AND COPYING DOCUMENTS FROM YOUR FILE <u>MUST</u> BE DIRECTED TO IDHR.

ATTORNEY REPRESENTATION:

If you cannot afford or have been unable to obtain a lawyer to represent you, the court having jurisdiction in your case may, assist you in obtaining a lawyer. If you plan to ask the court to help you obtain a lawyer, you must make this request of the court in the form and manner it requires. Your request to the court should be made well before the end of the 90-day period mentioned above. A request for representation does not relieve you of the obligation to file a lawsuit within this 90-day period.

DESTRUCTION OF FILE:

If you file suit, you or your attorney should forward a copy of your court complaint to this office. Your file will then be preserved. Unless you have notified us that you have filed suit, your charge file could be destroyed as early as six months after the date of the Notice of Right to Sue.

IF YOU FILE SUIT, YOU OR YOUR ATTORNEY SHOULD NOTIFY THIS OFFICE WHEN THE LAWSUIT IS RESOLVED.